

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Objection to the drawings

The examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The examiner asserts that “the ‘outer edge and inner edge of the control blades’” must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims.

Applicants note that the outer and inner edges of the control blades are clearly shown in the originally filed drawings. Revised Figs. 1, 2, 4, and 12-14 are shown in the “Replacement Sheets” of drawing appended herewith. These figures are revised to include reference numerals clearly identifying the outer edge 1111 and inner edge 1112 on Figs. 1, 2, and 4, and outer edge 3111 and inner edge 3112 on Figs. 12-14.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the specification

The specification has been amended to refer to the reference numerals added in the drawings, as discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added, since the outer and inner edges of the control elements have been fully discussed and illustrated in the original specification and drawings.

Rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claim objections

Claim 1 presently stands rejected as being indefinite. In particular, the examiner notes that “said fluid control elements” in line 8 is lacking antecedent basis. The examiner also objects to claim 2 as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, since the “control blades” are already recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a plurality of [...] fluid control elements” instead of “a plurality of [...] fluid control blades” in line 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that antecedent basis is provided for the subsequent recitation of that “said fluid control elements” in line 8. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 now is of proper dependent form, since “control blades” further limits “the fluid control elements.”

Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection and objection to the claims.

Rejection of claim 1-3, 7, and 11 in view of cited references; Allowable subject matter

Claims 1-3 and 11 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by White (U.S. 3,221,662), and claim 7 is rejected as being unpatentable over White. However, the examiner has indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. In this regard, claim 1 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 9, and claim 9 has been cancelled accordingly. Additionally, claim 11 is cancelled.

It is respectfully submitted that the incorporation of the allowable subject matter of claim 9 into claim 1 renders claim 1 allowable, and therefore claim 1 and claims 2, 3, and 7 which depend from claim 1 are allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-3 and 7 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Application No.: 10/606,739
Examiner: Theresa Trieu
Art Unit: 3748

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: October 31, 2006



JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921